



proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.* § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). However, “when objections to strictly legal issues are raised and no factual issues are challenged, de novo review of the record may be dispensed with.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). De novo review is also not required “when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Id.* Similarly, when no objection is filed, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, advisory committee note).

### **III. DISCUSSION**

Under Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a district court judge shall make a de novo determination of any portion of an M&R to which specific written objection has been made. No objection to the M&R having been filed, and the time for doing so having passed, the parties have waived their right to de novo review of any issue covered in the M&R.

The Court notes that Defendant filed the pending Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings on March 13, 2024. (Doc. No. 38). On October 24, 2024, the Court referred the motion to the Magistrate Judge, and the Magistrate Judge issued a Roseboro Order advising Plaintiff that he shall file a response to the pending motion on or before November 8, 2024. (Doc. No. 49). On November 21, 2024, following the

Magistrate Judge's issuance of the M&R, the Roseboro Order was returned as undeliverable. (Doc. No. 51). The Court observes that no response or any other filing has been made by Plaintiff in this case since February 9, 2024 – the day his attorney withdrew from representation. (Doc. No. 34). Plaintiff's former counsel, Mr. M. Shane Perry, withdrew pursuant to Rule of Professional Conduct 1.16 and provided the Court Plaintiff's last known address. (*Id.*). Since then, at least three documents mailed to Plaintiff have been returned as undeliverable. (Doc. Nos. 36, 44, 51). Plaintiff's failure to make any filing with the Court since at least February 2024 or to keep the Court apprised of any changes in his mailing address suggests that Plaintiff may have abandoned his claims. *See Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1441 (9th Cir. 1988) (“A party, not the district court, bears the burden of keeping the court apprised of any changes in his mailing address.”).

Nevertheless, this Court has conducted a full review of the M&R and other documents of record, and having done so, hereby finds that the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is, in all respects, in accordance with the law and should be approved. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as its own.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that:

1. The Magistrate Judge's M&R, (Doc. No. 50), is **ADOPTED**;
2. Defendant USAA Federal Savings Bank's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings, (Doc. No. 38), is **GRANTED**.

Signed: January 6, 2025

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Robert J. Conrad, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

Robert J. Conrad, Jr.  
United States District Judge

